

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are currently pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1-4 and 6-7 have been amended and claims 15-46 have been newly added by way of the present Amendment.

Claims 1, 2, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanazawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,140,984). Claims 4, 5, 8-10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanazawa et al. Claims 3, 6, and 11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanazawa et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. These claims recite a plurality of sustain electrodes and a plurality of priming electrodes. The priming electrodes are configured to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag.

Kanazawa et al. relates to a method of operating a plasma display panel and plasma display device. Kanazawa et al. merely disclose a first electrode and a second electrode that constitute a sustain electrode. The disclosure of sustain electrode in Kanazawa et al. does not anticipate a priming-electrode-configured-to-increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit there is no disclosure in Kanazawa et al. of the priming electrodes as recited in claims 1 and 2. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established in the rejections of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In response to the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanazawa et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claim 7 recites a plurality of sustain electrodes and a plurality of priming electrodes. The priming electrodes are configured to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag. For similar reasons, as discussed above, these recitations are not disclosed by Kanazawa et al. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established.

In response to the rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Kanazawa et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. These claims comprise the same recitations, discussed above, as claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, at least because Kanazawa et al. does not teach or suggest a plurality of priming electrodes to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

In response to the rejection of claims 8-10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable of Kanazawa et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. These claims comprise the same recitations, discussed above, as claim 7. Accordingly, at least because Kanazawa et al. does not teach or suggest a plurality of priming electrodes, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

The Applicants respectfully solicit favorable consideration of newly added claims 15-29. These claims recite an apparatus comprising a first electrode configured to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag in response to an electrical

pulse applied to the first electrode. The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied prior art references teach or suggest these recitations.

The Applicants respectfully solicit favorable consideration of newly added claims 30-44. These claims recite a method comprising priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag in response to an electrical pulse applied to a first electrode. The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied prior art references disclose this recitation.

The Applicants respectfully solicit favorable consideration of newly added claim 45. Claim 45 recites an apparatus comprising a discharge cell and a means of forming priming particles in the discharge cell to reduce discharge lag. The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied prior art references teach or suggest this recitation.

The Applicants respectfully solicit favorable consideration of newly added claim 46. Claim 46 comprises the same recitations as claim 1. For similar reasons that claim 1 is allowable, as set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 46 is allowable.

The Applicants wish to thank Examiner Patel for the indication of allowability of claims 3, 6, and 11. However, the Applicants have not amended these claims into independent form, as these claims are allowable base on their dependency from independent claims 1 and 7.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Daniel H. Sherr**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Daniel H. Sherr
Registration No. 46,425

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK/DHS:lms:ylw
Date: August 30, 2002